Topological classification of time-asymmetry in unitary quantum processes

Jacob Biamonte[1, 2, *] and Jacob Turner[3, 1, †]

[1] *Quantum Complexity Science Initiative*
Department of Physics, University of Malta, MSD 2080 Malta
[2] *Institute for Quantum Computing*
University of Waterloo, Waterloo, N2L 3G1 Ontario, Canada
[3] *Korteweg-de Vries Institute for Mathematics*
University of Amsterdam, 1098 XG Amsterdam, Netherlands

arXiv:1703.02542v1 [quant-ph] 7 Mar 2017

Effective gauge fields have allowed the emulation of matter under strong magnetic fields leading to the realization of Harper-Hofstadter, Haldane models, and led to demonstrations of one-way waveguides and topologically protected edge states. Central to these discoveries is the chirality induced by time-symmetry breaking. Due to the discovery of quantum search algorithms based on walks on graphs, recent work has discovered new implications the effect of time-reversal symmetry breaking has on the transport of quantum states and has brought with it a host of new experimental implementations. We provide a full classification of the unitary operators defining quantum processes which break time-reversal symmetry in their induced transition properties between basis elements in a preferred site-basis. Our results are furthermore proven in terms of the geometry of the corresponding Hamiltonian support graph and hence provide a topological classification. A quantum process of this type is necessarily time-symmetric for any choice of time-independent Hamiltonian if and only if the underlying support graph is bipartite. Moreover, for non-bipartite support, there exists a time-independent Hamiltonian with necessarily complex edge weights that induces time-asymmetric transition probabilities between edge(s). We further prove that certain bipartite graphs give rise to transition probability suppression, but not broken time-reversal symmetry. These results fill an important missing gap in understanding the role this omnipresent effect has in quantum physics. Furthermore, through our development of a general framework, along the way to our results we completely characterize gauge potentials on combinatorial graphs.

I. INTRODUCTION

Synthesis and emulation of artificial gauge fields for spinless particles has been realized in a number of experimental systems [1]. These experiments demonstrate that an artificial gauge field can be used to control an observed chirality induced by time-symmetry breaking. This in turn has profound implications for probability transfer control in quantum technologies and quantum algorithms based on quantum walks [2, 3]. Indeed, the marriage of these two disciplines will have impacts ranging from applications to transport in topological systems, gauge theories, topological quantum computing, topological insulators, and the fractional quantum hall effect. The present work provides a classification of any quantum processes into a topological dichotomy, found by changing paradigms in how time-symmetry theory is addressed in quantum theory. Our results were found porting over a host of powerful tools from geometric invariant theory.

Under our definition of time-symmetry in probability transport between graph nodes, we fully classify time-reversal symmetry for quantum processes on graphs. While in actuality, by a change of basis a process of this type can describe any unitary process, we choose to view them as so called, 'quantum walks' in this paper leading to a different notion of time-symmetry than usually considered [4]. In our notion of time-symmetry, measurement is implicit. It was recently argued in [5] that this should be the case as post-selection is the natural analog to preparation when time is reversed.

An interesting example of how the notion of time-symmetry classified here is different is the fact that we find the famous Hofstadter model to be time-symmetric as it is a walk on a bipartite graph. This contrasts with the more standard interpretation where this model is not time-symmetric [6] due to eigenfunctions occuring in conjugate pairs sharing the same energy.

The reason for this is that our main motivation is understanding transition probabilities. In the field of quantum walks, this is the most natural thing to consider as it allows analysis of quantum walks based processes along the same lines as stochastic processes. This is especially important in determining the "speed" at which a quantum walk converges to the desired state. As a result, we cannot distinguish processes that differ by complex conjugation.

Quantum walks [7, 8] are an established tool in quantum physics, quantum computing, and quantum information to study probability transfer. In quantum computing, they have been used to develop quantum search

* jacob.biamonte@qubit.org; www.QuamPlexity.org
† j.w.turner@uva.nl

algorithms generalizing Grover's algorithm [9–13], as an improvement over classical random walks and Markov processes [14–16], and quantum walks represent a universal model of quantum computation [17].

Quantum walks also provide an algorithmic lens for studying quantum transport in physical systems [2, 3]; for example photosynthetic complexes [18, 19]. Most recently the investigation of quantum transport phenomena has been expanded to so called, 'chiral quantum walks' [4], in which time symmetry is broken during unitary evolution [4, 20–24].

The behavior of the fundamental laws of physics under time-reversal has long remained central to the foundations of physics [25, 26] and has a host of applications in condensed matter theory [6, 27–30].

The practical importance of time-reversal symmetry breaking is demonstrated by its equivalence to introducing biased probability flow in a quantum system [4]. Time-symmetry breaking enables directed state transfer without requiring a biased (or non-local) distribution in the initial states, or coupling to an environment [4, 31–33]. The effect is however subtle: it is readily shown that time-reversal asymmetry cannot affect the site-to-site transport in some simple cases, such as a Hamiltonian with a support graph representing either a linear chain or a tree. On the other side, it is easily demonstrated that the effect is present in a range of physically and practically relevant scenarios. As such, it is of great interest to understand when such time-reversal symmetry breaking can occur.

In this paper, we do a detailed analysis of a set of fundamental symmetries preserving a preferred on-site basis and transition probabilities in the network topology. The symmetries are also very important in gauge theory, where they coincide with gauge symmetries in materials like graphene. We recover known effects in gauge theory, with rigorous mathematical proof, such as impossibility of time-symmetry in the presence of magnetic fields and the Aharonov-Bohm effect [34].

Furthermore, our recovery of these facts uses geometric invariant theory and differs from theoretical tools used in gauge theory. As such, we have found a new framework in which these phenomena can be understood. A consequence of our approach is a complete classification of gauge potentials on combinatorial graphs, which was first considered in [35]. However, our situation differs from the classical scenario by the aforementioned reasons. Indeed, we shall see that time-symmetry can exist for walks even in the presence of a magnetic flux if the walk takes place on a bipartite graph, which is the case for the Hofstadter model.

We establish directly and fully classify the Hamiltonians which enable the breaking of time-reversal symmetry in terms of their transition probabilities between elements in a preferred site-basis.

Organization of the paper: In the remainder of this section, we discuss the history of the problem of understanding probability transfer in mathematics and show how time-symmetry in quantum walks generalize several classical notions. In Section II, we establish the symmetries necessary to understand time-symmetry are of a simple form. Then, in Section III, we consider the emergence of time-symmetry as a result of trivial gauge potentials and classify all gauge potentials on graphs up to gauge equivalence. In Section IV, we see that time-symmetry can exist even on graphs with non-trivial gauge potentials if the graph is bipartite. Lastly, we consider some other related effects that immediately follow from our techniques.

A. The Probability Transfer Problem

A continuous time quantum walk [17, 36–38] is a quantum operator $U(t) = e^{-itH}$ acting on a normalized vector—for quantum search the normalized all-ones vector and for transport, a state in the site-basis. The Hamiltonian H is an adjacency matrix of a weighted bidirected graph: the Hermitian constraint being that $H = H^\dagger$. We call this graph the support of H, which we define more formerly later.

Consequently, the quantum evolution of $U(t)$ induces a walk on a graph induced by H. In the quantum walks literature, H is typically considered as being symmetric, with real valued (and possibly even negative) edge weights: but it needn't be. More precisely, an edge e connecting vertices v and w can have conjugate weights with respect to H depending if it is viewed as an edge from $v \to w$ or vice versa. Unless explicitly stated, we will assume that the support of our Hamiltonian is connected and simple. However, as will become apparent, it is natural to include self-loops in the case when all of them have the same weight. This is the setting needed to recover the notion of chiral quantum walks. Immediately one then asks, "when can such a process induce time-asymmetric evolutions?"

The question of which processes induce transition probabilities that are symmetric with respect to time must be made more precise: Consider a set $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathrm{End}(V)$, where V is a complex Hilbert space with a chosen orthonormal basis B. We are given a function $P : B \times B \times \mathcal{L} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Equivalently, $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}_{|B|\times|B|}(\mathbb{C}^{|B|})$, which is to say that $M \in \mathcal{L}$ is matrix from $\mathbb{C}^{|B|}$ to itself expressed in the preferred basis B. Often this function is written as $P_{s\to f}(M)$ where s and f are basis vectors of V and $M \in \mathcal{L}$. The problem is then to classify those operators $M(t)$ such that $P_{s\to f}(M(t)) - P_{f\to s}(M(t)) = 0$ for all basis vectors $f, s \in B$ and all times t.

From the point of view of quantum walks, basis vectors in B are identified with vertices in a graph defined by M, on which we consider probabilistic walks. $P_{s\to f}(M)$ gives the probability of moving from node s to node f. We now look at a two more classical examples that use matrices to define dynamics on graphs in a similar fashion. In each of our examples, t represents a time parameter that allows the walk to evolve.

Example I.1. Motivationally, we examine this same classification for a subset of stochastic processes. Let S be a valid infinitesimal stochastic generator of a continuous-time Markov process, so $s_{ij} \geq 0$ for $i \neq j$, and $\sum_j q_{ij} = 0$ for all i. Then the set of matrices of the form $U(t) = e^{tS}$ is stochastic semi-group. As a caveat, not all stochastic matrices arise this way [39]. This is because every stochastic matrix of this form is invertible, which is not the case in general, although it's inverse may not necessarily be a stochastic process as well. We define the probability function $P_{s\to f} = U(t)_{fs} = f^\dagger U s$. The *stochastic probability current* is defined by $\hat{s}_{s,f}(U(t)) := U(t)_{fs} - U(t)_{sf} = 0$. Then the following are equivalent:

1. $\hat{s}_{s,f}(U(t)) = 0$ for all s, f, and t.
2. $S = S^T$, i.e. S is a Dirichlet operator.

Requiring $U(t)$ to be doubly stochastic isn't sufficient for $\hat{s}_{s,f}(U(t)) = 0$, since there exist non-symmetric doubly-stochastic matrices with positive eigenvalues, which then have a real logarithm. Zero stochastic probability current is a strictly stronger condition than the reversibility of a Markov chain at some stationary distribution, implying time symmetry at any initial distribution.

Example I.2. Another related, but less well known example comes from quantum processes. Let H be Hermitian and define $U(t) = e^{-itH}$. The *quantum amplitude current* is defined to be $\hat{q}_{s,f}(U(t)) := U(t)_{fs} - U(t)_{sf} = 0$. Then the following are equivalent:

1. $\hat{q}_{s,f}(U(t)) = 0$ for all s, f, and t.
2. $H = H^T$.
3. $[H, K] = 0$, where K is the anti-unitary operator defined by complex conjugation in the same basis as H.

These two examples are mathematically similar, and in fact the first example is a special case of the second. The set of stochastic generators S that are also symmetric matrices forms a strict subset of symmetric matrices, so $\hat{s}_{s,f}(U(t)) = 0$ for all s, f and t implies that $\hat{q}_{s,f}(U(t)) = 0$ for all s, f, and t.

B. Quantum Probability Current

The goal of this paper is to study a transition symmetry problem introduced in [4]. As in Example I.2, we let $U(t) = e^{-itH}$ for H Hermitian. We define $P_{s\to f}(U(t)) = |U(t)_{sf}|^2 = |U(t)^\dagger_{fs}|^2$. If the quantum walk starts with a particle at vertex s, then $\jmath_{sf}(U(t))$ gives the probability of seeing vertex f after applying $U(t)$ and performing a measurement. The *quantum probability current* is defined as $\jmath_{sf}(U(t)) := |U(t)_{fs}|^2 - |U(t)^\dagger_{sf}|^2$.

Definition I.3. A quantum process is *time-symmetric* if $\jmath_{sf}(U(t)) = 0$ for all s, f and t.

The reason for the name time-symmetric is that $U(t)^\dagger_{sf} = U(-t)_{sf}$. Thus $\jmath_{sf}(U(t)) = 0$ implies that $|U(t)_{sf}|^2 = |U(-t)_{sf}|^2$. If the quantum probability current vanishes, we can evolve time in the opposite direction and not change the transition probabilities between nodes.

Examples I.1 and I.2 are both special cases of the quantum probability current in the following sense. We see that for a quantum process with unitary operator e^{-itH}, if $H = H^T$, then H must be real and thus trivially time-symmetric. So both of the aforementioned examples arise as subsets of time-symmetric chiral quantum walks. However, we shall see that there are other walks which are time-symmetric that do not fall into the above situations.

We shall give a characterization of those Hamiltonians that enable time-symmetry breaking by viewing them as the adjacency matrix of a weighted graph. For the previous examples, time-symmetry was equivalent to the Hamiltonian defining an bidirected weighted graph (which means it can be viewed as undirected). In the general setting, there are further conditions the graph must satisfy.

II. THE VANISHING OF THE QUANTUM PROBABILITY CURRENT

We can always write a unitary operator as $U(t) = e^{-itH}$ where H is Hermitian. Then $P_{s\to f}(U(t)) = |f^\dagger e^{-itH} s|^2 = |s^\dagger e^{itH} f|^2 = P_{f\to s}(U^\dagger(t))$. Furthermore, since taking complex conjugates does not change the norm, we also have $P_{s\to f}(U(t)) = P_{f\to s}(U^T(t))$. Thus, if $U(t)$ is time-symmetric, we must have $P_{s\to f}(U(t)) = P_{s\to f}(U^T(t)) = P_{s\to f}(U^\dagger(t))$ for all $s, f \in B$ and times t. We approach this problem by understanding the symmetries (and what they leave invariant) that preserve the preferred basis and take unitary operators to unitary operators.

Since $U(t)$, $U^T(t)$, and $U^\dagger(t)$ are all unitary operators, if they are related by a symmetry, it must be a completely positive map. Furthermore, since we demand that this map holds for all time t, we see that there must exist a unitary matrix V such that either $VU(t)V^\dagger = U^T(t)$ or $VU(T)V^\dagger = U^\dagger(t)$. This is because the only linear maps commuting with matrix multiplication is conjugation and scaling. However, we have fixed the diagonal of our Hamiltonian to be zero so we cannot scale $U(t)$ non-trivially.

Lastly, since we are working in a preferred basis B, V must be a combination of a permutation of the basis elements of B and a matrix that has this basis as eigenvectors. However, since we label our basis vectors, conjugation by a permutation matrix is simply a relabeling and thus does nothing with respect to our classification.

This means that V can be taken to be a unitary matrix that is diagonal in the basis B.

Therefore, we have that $U(t)$ is time-symmetric if and only if there exists a diagonal unitary matrix Λ such that either $\Lambda U(t)\Lambda^\dagger = U^T(t)$ or $\Lambda U(t)\Lambda^\dagger = U^\dagger(t)$. Equivalently, we say that an operator is time-symmetric if $U(t)$ can be related to $U(t)^T$ by diagonal unitary matrices and/or complex conjugation in the basis of B.

We denote the set of diagonal $n \times n$ unitary matrices by $U(1)^n$. We call this action the Λ-action and we will completely determine when a unitary matrix U can be taken to $U^\dagger$ or U^T by this action. Our classification does not depend on the value of t (unless $t = 0$), and so we simply consider unitary matrices instead of unitary operators throughout the rest of this paper.

Definition II.1. The *support* of an $n \times n$ matrix M is a digraph with n vertices and an edge from vertex i to vertex j if $M_{ij} \neq 0$. We denote it by $supp(M)$.

Note that for a Hermitian matrix H, the support is undirected (in the sense that every directed edge has an directed edge in the opposite direction which we can take as a single non-directed edge) as $H_{ij} \neq 0$ if and only if $H_{ji} = \overline{H_{ij}} \neq 0$. We can think of H as a weighted adjacency matrix. Then we have the weight of traveling in one direction along an edge is the complex conjugate of the weight of traveling the opposite direction.

Our classification will actually be in terms of the Hamiltonian of an operator. This is because $\Lambda e^{-itH}\Lambda^\dagger = e^{-it\Lambda H\Lambda^\dagger}$ and $\overline{e^{-itH}} = e^{it\overline{H}}$. So each of the symmetries we consider induces a natural action on the Hamiltonians defining the operator.

III. CLASSIFYING GAUGE POTENTIALS ON GRAPHS

Much work has been done to understand gauge theory on metric graphs, and recently this was simplified further to understanding gauge potentials on combinatorial graphs [35]. In this setting, one considers the graph to be support of the Hamiltonian H. If we write $H = \{r_{jk}e^{i\theta_{jk}}\}$, then let $\Omega = \{\theta_{jk}\}$, with $\theta_{jk} = 0$ if $r_{jk} = 0$. This is a skew-symmetric matrix which is defined as a gauge potential on $supp(H)$ in [35]. The Λ-action on H induces an action on the gauge potentials which corresponds precisely to the gauge transformations in this setting. We call this model the HKR model after the authors.

One question of interest is understanding when H is equivalent to real matrix under the Λ-action. Equivalently, when is the gauge potential induced by H equivalent to a trivial gauge potential. This question was solved in [35]. However, we are also interested in knowing when H and $\overline{H}$ can be related by the Λ-action for the following reason.

As previously mentioned, fixing a basis B defines a complex conjugation involution on linear maps, $M \mapsto \overline{M}$. It is always the case that $P_{s\to f}(\overline{U(t)}) = P_{s\to f}(U(t))$. But if H and $\overline{H}$ can be related by the Λ-action, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{s\to f}(\overline{U(t)}) &= |f^\dagger \overline{e^{-itH}} s|^2 \\ &= |f^\dagger e^{it\overline{H}} s|^2 = |f^\dagger e^{itH} s|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

So if H is conjugate via the Λ-action to its transpose, then H is time-symmetric combining the Λ-action with the action of complex conjugation in our chosen basis.

Definition III.1. Let H be Hermitian and $c = i_1 \to i_2 \to \cdots \to i_k$ be a path in $supp(H)$. Then we define the weight of p to be $w_c(H) = H_{i_1 i_2} \cdots H_{i_{k-1} i_k}$. We define the *Aharonov-Bohm phase* of a cycle c to be the complex angle of $w_c(H)$.

The Aharonov-Bohm phase defined above completely coincides with the classical notion of the Aharonov-Bohm phase for the HKR model. As we will see, these phases completely determine the gauge potentials up to gauge transformation. However, they do not completely determine when two Hamiltonians are equivalent under the Λ-action. For that, the values $w_c(H)$ are necessary.

The Λ-action is the same as conjugation by $U(1)^n$, if H is $n \times n$. This is the group of gauge transformations for the HKR model. We consider the polynomial invariants of this action which are generated by the weights of cycles as we defined above (which are allowed to repeat edges or vertices) in the support of H of length $\leq n$.

More formally, let $\mathrm{Mat}_n(\mathbb{C})$ denote the set of $n \times n$ matrices in basis B. Then the polynomials $H_{i_1 i_2} \cdots H_{i_k i_1}$, where $1 \leq k \leq n$ generate the invariant ring $\mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Mat}_n(\mathbb{C})]^{U(1)^n}$, where $\mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Mat}_n(\mathbb{C})]^{U(1)^n}$ is the ring of polynomials that are constant on the orbits of $U(1)^n$. We emphasize that invariants of the form $H_{ij}H_{ji} = |H_{ij}|^2$ and H_{ii} are included. However, these invariants are necessarily real and so we call these the *trivial invariants*.

We claim that two Hermitian matrices are in the same $U(1)^n$ orbit if and only if they have the same values on all invariants. It is easy to see that if two Hamiltonians differ in their invariants, they cannot be in the same orbit as these functions are constant on orbits. Furthermore, a function that is constant on a set is also constant on the closure of that set, so orbits whose closures intersect cannot be distinguished via invariants. We prove that this does not happen.

We mention that since we are considering polynomial invariants, the correct topology to use is, *a priori*, the Zariski topology. However, in this setting, it is well known that the closure of an orbit in the Zariski and Euclidean topologies will coincide.

We wish to show that the orbit closures of two Hermitian matrices do not intersect. We first consider the orbit closures of Hermitian matrices under the action of the closely related group $\mathrm{GL}(1)^n$. This group action has exactly the same invariant polynomials as $U(1)^n$ as it is well known that the unitary group is Zariski dense inside the general linear group of the same dimension. This is sometimes called Weyl's trick. See for example [40].

Theorem III.2 (Hilbert-Mumford Criterion [41]). *If G is a product of general linear groups acting on a complex vector space V, then if $\overline{G.v} - G.v \neq \emptyset$, there is some $y \in \overline{G.v} - G.v \neq \emptyset$ and a 1-parameter subgroup $\lambda : \mathbb{C}^\times \to G$ such that $\lim_{t\to 0} \lambda(t).v = y$.*

For the action of of $\mathrm{GL}(1)^n \curvearrowright \mathrm{Mat}_n(\mathbb{C})$ by conjugation, the only 1-parameter subgroups in $\mathrm{GL}(1)^n$ are diagonal matrices of the form $\lambda(t)_{ii} = t^{\alpha_i}$, $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ (cf. [40]). If the orbit of M is closed, then there is no 1-parameter subgroup taking M outside of its orbit by Theorem III.2. If $\lambda(t)$ is diagonal with $\lambda(t)_{ii} = t^{\alpha_i}$, then $\lambda(t)M\lambda(t)^{-1} = \{t^{\alpha_i - \alpha_j} m_{ij}\}$. If $\lim_{t\to 0} \lambda(t)M\lambda(t)^{-1}$ exists, then no negative power of t appears in $\lambda(t)M\lambda(t)^{-1}$. Furthermore, the limit sends some of the entries of M to zero and leaves the rest unchanged.

Proposition III.3. *Hermitian matrices have closed orbits under the action of* $\mathrm{GL}(1)^n$.

Proof. Let $\lambda(t)$ be a 1-parameter subgroup such that $\lim_{t\to 0} \lambda(t)M\lambda(t)^{-1}$ exists, M Hermitian. Then suppose $t^{\alpha_i - \alpha_j} m_{ij}$, $\alpha_i > \alpha_j$, is an non-zero entry of $\lambda(t)M\lambda(t)^{-1}$. Then so is $t^{\alpha_j - \alpha_i} m_{ji}$. Thus it's easy to see that as $t \to 0$, $t^{\alpha_j - \alpha_i} m_{ji}$ goes to infinity. So it must be that $\lambda(t)M\lambda(t)^{-1} = M$, implying it has a closed orbit. □

The following proposition tells us that by restricting our view to matrices that have closed orbits, all the information we need is given by the invariant polynomials.

Proposition III.4 ([42]). *For a product of general linear groups acting on a complex vector space V, if M_1 and M_2 have closed orbits, they are in the same orbit if and only if they agree on all invariants.*

Theorem III.5. *Two $n \times n$ Hermitian matrices are in the same $U(1)^n$ orbit if and only if they agree on all invariants. Furthermore, two gauge potentials can be related by a gauge transformation if and only if their Aharanov-Bohm phases coincide.*

Proof. The first assertion follows from Propositions III.3 and III.4 along with the observation that two Hermitian matrices are similar via a change of basis if and only if they are similar via a unitary change of basis.

For the second assertion, we again note that the norms of the entries of a Hamiltonian are left unaffected by the Λ-action. Given gauge potentials $\Omega = \{\theta_{jk}\}$ and $\Omega' = \{\theta'_{jk}\}$ with $j, k \in [n]$, we consider the Hamiltonians $H = \{e^{i\theta_{jk}}\}$ and $H' = \{e^{i\theta'_{jk}}\}$.

For a cycle $c : i_1 \to i_2 \to \cdots \to i_k \to i_1$ in the complete graph on n vertices K_n, let $\omega_c := \theta_{k1} + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \theta_{j,j+1}$ be the associated Aharanov-Bohm phase for the gauge potential Ω. We define ω'_c similarly. Then H and H' can be related by the Λ-action if and only if $w_c(H) = e^{i\omega_c} = e^{i\omega'_c} = w_c(H')$ for all cycles c in K_n. This implies that the two gauge potentials are equivalent if and only if $\omega_c = \omega'_c$ (modulo 2π) for all cycles c in K_n. That is to say, they agree if and only if their Aharanov-Bohm phases coincide. □

Theorem III.6. *A Hermitian matrix H takes real values on its invariants if and only if it is conjugate to a real matrix via $U(1)^n$. Furthermore, H is conjugate to $\overline{H}$ if and only if H is also conjugate to a real matrix.*

Proof. If H is conjugate to a real matrix or its support is a tree, this it is clear that all of its invariants are real. Now suppose H takes real values on all of its invariants. Note that $|H|$ takes the same value on all of these invariants. Since H and $|H|$ are both Hermitian, their orbits are closed and thus there is a $\Lambda \in U(1)^n$ such that $|H| = \Lambda H \Lambda^\dagger$ by Theorem III.5.

Now let $w_p(H)$ be the invariant defined by looking at the weight of the cycle p in the support of H with edge weights induced by H. Then it is clear that $w_p(H) = \overline{w_p(\overline{H})}$. So we see that H and $\overline{H}$ are conjugate if and only if $w_p(H) = \overline{w_p(H)}$ by Theorem III.5. But this happens if and only if all invariants of H are real and by the first assertion of the theorem, is equivalent to the fact that H is conjugate to a real matrix. □

Corollary III.7. *If a Hermitian matrix takes real values on all of its invariants, it is time-symmetric.*

Proof. From Theorem III.6, we know that H is conjugate to a real matrix, which makes it time-symmetric. □

We mention that if all of the invariants of H are real, this is called a *trivial gauge potential* in [35]. In that paper, they showed that a gauge potential was trivial if and only if all of the phases on the entries of H could be removed using gauge transformations. However, for classification result, we needed to understand when H and $\overline{H}$ where gauge equivalent as well, which was hitherto unknown. As it so happens, we now see this happens if and only if H defines a trivial gauge potential. We see that a gauge potential is trivial if and only if all of its Aharonov-Bohm phases are zero, in agreement with a known effect in gauge theory.

IV. HAMILTONIANS UNDER THE Λ-ACTION

In this section, we shall see that our notion of time-symmetry can occur even if the graph has a non-trivial gauge potential. If $U(t) = e^{-itH}$, where H is Hermitian, then under the Λ-action, for any diagonal unitary matrix Λ,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{s\to f}(\Lambda U(t)\Lambda^\dagger) &= |f^\dagger e^{-it\Lambda H\Lambda^\dagger} s|^2 \\ &= |f^\dagger e^{-itH} s|^2 = P_{s\to f}(U(t)) \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

as previously mentioned.

Theorem IV.1. *A Hamiltonian H with zero diagonal is conjugate to its negative under the Λ-action if and only if its support is bipartite.*

Proof. Only the 'if' direction was proven in [4]; we include a proof here for completeness. Suppose that the $supp(H)$ is bipartite. If H is $n \times n$, let the vertices be labeled by $1, \ldots, n$. Let $A = \{a_1, \ldots, a_k\} \subset [n]$ denote one of the independent sets of $supp(H)$. Let B denote the other. Then let $\Lambda_{ii} = -1$ for $i \in A$ and 1 otherwise. Then $(\Lambda H \Lambda^\dagger)_{ij} = \Lambda_{ii} H_{ij} \Lambda_{jj}^{-1}$. We know that$H_{ij}$ is 0 unless exactly one of either i or j is in A as its support is bipartite. Then $\Lambda_{ii} H_{ij} \Lambda_{jj}^{-1} = -H_{ij}$. So $\Lambda H \Lambda^\dagger = -H$.

For the converse, suppose that H is conjugate to $-H$, i.e. $\exists \Lambda$ such that $\Lambda H \Lambda^\dagger = -H$. We know from Theorem III.5 that this implies $w_c(H) = w_c(-H)$ for all cycles c. But $w_c(H)$ is a homogeneous monomial of degree $|c|$, the length of c. So $w_c(-H) = (-1)^{|c|} w_c(H)$, implying that $w_c(H) = 0$ if $|c|$ is odd. Since H can only have even cycles in its support, it is bipartite. □

Note that this necessarily requires that H have zeros on the diagonal. However, one can trivially see that for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{s\to f}(e^{-it(H+\alpha I)}) &= P_{s\to f}(e^{-i\alpha t I} e^{-itH}) \\ &= P_{s\to f}(e^{-itH}). \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

So if H is time-symmetric, $H + \alpha I$ is as well. In particular, the $supp(H)$ can be bipartite with self-loops if the every loop has the same weight. However, one cannot add arbitrary diagonal matrices to H and preserve time symmetry.

Example IV.2. The following Hamiltonian is not time-symmetric however because the diagonal contains distinct entries, although if the diagonal is made to be all zeros, then the support is bipartite.

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & i \\ 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 3 & 1 \\ -i & 0 & 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$$

We note if one defines a time-symmetric process as one that makes the quantum probability current vanish, then as a consequence of Theorem IV.1, the only graphs admitting time-asymmetric walks are non-bipartite graphs.

We see now that if the support of a Hamiltonian is bipartite, it is time-symmetric regardless of complex phases of its entries. However, the condition that Hamiltonian has real invariants is very dependent of the complex phases of the entries of the Hamiltonian. As such it is very easy to construct examples of time-symmetric processes where U and U^T cannot be related by the Λ-action but U and $U^\dagger$ can.

A. Disorder and Phase Independence

Using the invariant techniques developed above, we can quickly answer two other interesting questions. Suppose disorder is added to a system by changing the energies of nodes, i.e. having self loops of different weights. This corresponds to adding a real diagonal matrix to the Hamiltonian. As Example IV.2 shows, adding disorder can break time symmetry. The following proposition gives a necessary condition for this to not break time symmetry.

Proposition IV.3. *If H is conjugate to a real matrix via $U(1)^n$, then for any real diagonal matrix D, $H + D$ is time-symmetric.*

Proof. If there is a $\Lambda \in U(1)^n$ such that $\Lambda H \Lambda^\dagger$ is real, then $\Lambda(H + D)\Lambda^\dagger = \Lambda H \Lambda^\dagger + D$ is also real and thus time-symmetric. □

If we are given a Hamiltonian $H = (h_{ij} e^{i\alpha_{ij}})$ with $h_{ij}, \alpha_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the second interesting question is how the transition probabilities are affected by the choice of phases α_{ij}. It was shown in [4] that if the underlying graph of H is a tree, then surprisingly, the transition probabilities are not affected by the choice of α_{ij}. The following proposition shows that generically this is the only case where this happens.

Proposition IV.4. *The transition probabilities of a walk is independent of the choice of α_{ij} if and only if the (undirected) support of H is a tree (with possible self-loops).*

Proof. First of all, if the support of H is a tree, the only invariants are trivial invariants which specifies the norm of each entry in H. This means that H can always be made real no matter the starting choice of α_{ij}. Now suppose H is not a tree and e^{-itH} has a non-zero diagonal entry. Then there is a non-trivial cycle invariant $w(c)$ for a cycle $c : i_1 \to i_2 \to \cdots i_k \to i_1$, $k > 2$. By changing the phase of i_1, we change the phase of $w(c)$ and thus we get a continuous family of quantum walks that cannot be related by the group generated by K and the Λ-action. □

The above proposition also immediately implies that trees are the only graphs with exactly one gauge potential up to gauge transformations in the HKR model.

V. CONCLUSION

Our theory provides more than a classification of quantum processes and should have applications in several related fields. For example, our work can be related to the theory of tomography where it can serve as a theory for classification.

The doubly stochastic matrices arise by taking a unitary matrix $U = \{u_{ij}\}$ to the matrix $\{|u_{ij}(t)|^2\}$. Understanding the image of this map inside the Birkhoff polytope, called the set of unistochastic matrices, has been an important problem in tomography. Of note is the problem of reconstructing the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Masakawa matrix describing quark decay [43, 44]. Experimentally only the transition probabilities can be determined

[45, 46]. This matrix was important in demonstrating another symmetry violation, namely CP-violation, and lead to a Nobel Prize in Physics. Work on reconstructing the Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata matrix in neutrino physics is still an unfinished [47]. The unistochastic matrices also are important in scattering theory [48] and quantum information [49].

An important aspect of the map taking the unitary group to the set of unistochastic matrices are natural symmetries on the fibers. Every fiber has set of fundamental symmetries sometimes called Haagerup equivalence, although these do not generally account for all of the symmetries. In this subject, more focus has been placed on understanding the exotic symmetries. However, the Haagerup equivalence symmetries are omnipresent in these problems. Furthermore, they correspond to the symmetries classified with the theory in this paper: the Λ-action and complex conjugation. We have developed tools that allow that application of invariant theory to understanding these and other fundamental symmetries.

Acknowledgments

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC grant agreement No 339109.

[1] Hyang-Tag Lim, Emre Togan, Martin Kroner, Javier Miguel-Sanchez, and Atac Imamoglu. Electrically tunable artificial gauge potential for polaritons. *Nature Communications*, 8, 2017.

[2] Oliver Mülken and Alexander Blumen. Continuous-time quantum walks: Models for coherent transport on complex networks. *Physics Reports*, 502(2):37–87, 2011.

[3] Oliver Mülken, Veronika Bierbaum, and Alexander Blumen. Coherent exciton transport in dendrimers and continuous-time quantum walks. *The Journal of chemical physics*, 124(12):124905, 2006.

[4] Z. Zimborás, M. Faccin, Z. Kádár, J. D. Whitfield, B. P. Lanyon, and J. Biamonte. Quantum transport enhancement by time-reversal symmetry breaking. *Sci. Rep.*, 3:2361, August 2013.

[5] Ognyan Oreshkov and Nicolas J Cerf. Operational formulation of time reversal in quantum theory. *Nature Physics*, 2015.

[6] D. R. Hofstadter. Energy levels and wave functions of Bloch electrons in rational and irrational magnetic fields. *Phys. Rev. B*, 14:2239–2249, Sep 1976.

[7] Julia Kempe. Quantum random walks: an introductory overview. *Contemporary Physics*, 44(4):307–327, 2003.

[8] Salvador Elías Venegas-Andraca. Quantum walks: a comprehensive review. *Quantum Information Processing*, 11(5):1015–1106, 2012.

[9] Thomas G Wong. Faster quantum walk search on a weighted graph. *Physical Review A*, 92(3):032320, 2015.

[10] Thomas G Wong. Grover search with lackadaisical quantum walks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1502.04567*, 2015.

[11] Neil Shenvi, Julia Kempe, and K Birgitta Whaley. Quantum random-walk search algorithm. *Physical Review A*, 67(5):052307, 2003.

[12] Hari Krovi, Frédéric Magniez, Maris Ozols, and Jérémie Roland. Quantum walks can find a marked element on any graph. *Algorithmica*, pages 1–57, 2015.

[13] Andrew M Childs and Jeffrey Goldstone. Spatial search by quantum walk. *Physical Review A*, 70(2):022314, 2004.

[14] Cristopher Moore and Alexander Russell. Quantum walks on the hypercube. In *Randomization and Approximation Techniques in Computer Science*, pages 164–178. Springer, 2002.

[15] Andrew M Childs, Richard Cleve, Enrico Deotto, Edward Farhi, Sam Gutmann, and Daniel A Spielman. Exponential algorithmic speedup by a quantum walk. In *Proceedings of the thirty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 59–68. ACM, 2003.

[16] Mario Szegedy. Quantum speed-up of markov chain based algorithms. In *Foundations of Computer Science, 2004. Proceedings. 45th Annual IEEE Symposium on*, pages 32–41. IEEE, 2004.

[17] A. M. Childs. Universal computation by quantum walk. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 102:180501, May 2009.

[18] Masoud Mohseni, Patrick Rebentrost, Seth Lloyd, and Alan Aspuru-Guzik. Environment-assisted quantum walks in photosynthetic energy transfer. *The Journal of chemical physics*, 129(17):174106, 2008.

[19] Patrick Rebentrost, Masoud Mohseni, Ivan Kassal, Seth Lloyd, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik. Environment-assisted quantum transport. *New Journal of Physics*, 11(3):033003, 2009.

[20] P. Xiang, M. Litinskaya, E. A. Shapiro, and R. V. Krems. Non-adiabatic control of quantum energy transfer in ordered and disordered arrays. *New J. Phys.*, 15(6):063015, 2013.

[21] S. Bedkihal, M. Bandyopadhyay, and D. Segal. The probe technique far from equilibrium: Magnetic field symmetries of nonlinear transport. *Eur. Phys. J. B*, 86(12):1–18, 2013.

[22] D. Manzano and P. I. Hurtado. Symmetry and the thermodynamics of currents in open quantum systems. *Phys. Rev. B*, 90:125138, Sep 2014.

[23] T. G. Wong. Quantum walk search with time-reversal symmetry breaking. *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.*, 48:405303, 2015.

[24] S. Cameron, S. Fehrenbach, L. Granger, O. Hennigh, S. Shrestha, and C. Tamon. Universal state transfer on graphs. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 455:115–142, 2014.

[25] E. P. Wigner. *Group Theory and its Application to the Quantum Mechanics of Atomic Spectra*. New York: Academic Press, 1959.

[26] M. Skotiniotis, B. Toloui, I. T. Durham, and B. C. Sanders. Quantum frameness for cpt symmetry. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 111(2):020504, July 2013.

[27] R. Peierls. On the theory of diamagnetism of conduction electrons. *Z. Phys.*, 80:763–791, 1933.

[28] S. Das Sarma and A. Pinczuk. *Perspectives in quantum Hall effects*. John Wiley & Sons, 2008.

[29] M. Z. Hasan and C. L. Kane. Colloquium: Topological insulators. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 82:3045–3067, Nov 2010.

[30] Jean Dalibard, Fabrice Gerbier, Gediminas Juzeliūnas, and Patrik Öhberg. Colloquium: Artificial gauge potentials for neutral atoms. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 83:1523–1543, Nov 2011.

[31] M. B. Plenio and S. F. Huelga. Dephasing-assisted transport: quantum networks and biomolecules. *New J. Phys.*, 10(11):113019, 2008.

[32] I. Sinayskiy, A. Marais, F. Petruccione, and A. Ekert. Decoherence-assisted transport in a dimer system. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 108(2):020602, January 2012.

[33] S. Bose. Quantum communication through spin chain dynamics: an introductory overview. *Contemporary Physics*, 48(1):13–30, 2007.

[34] Yakir Aharonov and David Bohm. Significance of electromagnetic potentials in the quantum theory. *Physical Review*, 115(3):485, 1959.

[35] JM Harrison, JP Keating, and JM Robbins. Quantum statistics on graphs. In *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, volume 467, pages 212–233. The Royal Society, 2011.

[36] O. Mülken and A. Blumen. Continuous-time quantum walks: Models for coherent transport on complex networks. *Phys. Rep.*, 502:37–87, 2011.

[37] M. Faccin, T. Johnson, J. D. Biamonte, S. Kais, and P. Migdał. Degree distribution in quantum walks on complex networks. *Phys. Rev. X*, 3:041007, Oct 2013.

[38] S. Perseguers, M. Lewenstein, A. Acín, and J. I. Cirac. Quantum random networks. *Nature Physics*, 6:539–543, 2010.

[39] EB Davies. Embeddable markov matrices. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 15:1474–1486, 2010.

[40] Hanspeter Kraft and Claudio Procesi. Classical invariant theory, a primer. *Lecture Notes, Version*, 2000.

[41] George R Kempf. Instability in invariant theory. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 299–316, 1978.

[42] D. Mumford, J. Fogarty, and F. Kirwan. *Geometric invariant theory*, volume 34 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (2) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (2)]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, third edition, 1994.

[43] Nicola Cabibbo. Unitary symmetry and leptonic decays. *Physical Review Letters*, 10(12):531, 1963.

[44] Makoto Kobayashi and Toshihide Maskawa. CP-violation in the renormalizable theory of weak interaction. *Progress of Theoretical Physics*, 49(2):652–657, 1973.

[45] Cecilia Jarlskog. Commutator of the quark mass matrices in the standard electroweak model and a measure of maximal CP nonconservation. *Physical Review Letters*, 55(10):1039, 1985.

[46] Petre Dita. Global fits to the Cabibbo–Kobayashi–Maskawa matrix: unitarity condition method versus standard unitarity triangles approach. *Modern Physics Letters A*, 20(23):1709–1721, 2005.

[47] Ziro Maki, Masami Nakagawa, and Shoichi Sakata. Remarks on the unified model of elementary particles. *Progress of Theoretical Physics*, 28(5):870–880, 1962.

[48] G Mennessier and Jean Nuyts. Some unitarity bounds for finite matrices. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 15(9):1525–1537, 1974.

[49] Reinhard F Werner. All teleportation and dense coding schemes. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 34(35):7081, 2001.